## JOHN MONTY.

[To accompany Bill H. R. No. 580.]

APRIL 6, 1860.

Mr. Briggs, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, made the following

## REPORT.

The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to whom was referred the petition of John Monty, report:

That this claim was favorably reported on the 24th day of January, 1857; that report with the evidence has been re-examined, and your committee concurring entirely with that report adopt it, and report a bill similar in all respects to the one then reported.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, January 24, 1857.

Mr. K. Miller, from the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, made the following report:

The Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of John Monty, praying to be paid his bounty money, gratuity, and land, report:

That the petitioner, under oath, declares that he served as a warsman in General Hazen's regiment, or Congress regiment; that he never received his bounty money, or the gratuity of eighty dollars, promised by resolution of Congress to those soldiers who enlisted and served to the end of the war, and that he is a United States pensioner. In the supplementary petition he states that the land granted to him under the acts of Congress of March 3, 1855, and amended by act of May 14, 1856, is withheld by the Commissioner of Pensions. The petitioner relies on the records and evidence on file in the Pension office to substantiate his claim; and they are furnished, through a communication from the Commissioner of Pensions, in answer to information called for by your committee. He states that "no soldier by the name of John Monty, of Hazen's regiment, received his bounty money and the \$80 reward promised by resolution of Congress of May

15, 1778," neither did any "soldier by the name of John Monty" receive "his bounty land for services in the revolutionary war;" that a soldier named "Jacque Monty served to the close of the war in Hazen's regiment, and received the gratuity of \$40 and one hundred acres of land as such warsman; that in the printed copy of the return of warsman, made by the board of war in the land registry, and in our transcript of the rolls of Hazen's regiment, the name is spelled Jacque, in another transcript it is spelled Jack;" that "Hazen's regiment was made up mostly of Canadian refugees, and Monty was, in all probability, a Canadian Frenchman; that the French language, as spoken in Canada, is a great deal corrupted, and there seems to be no reason to doubt that the word Jacque is a contraction for the French word Jaques, which answers to the English James, and written as pronounced; that John Monty applied for and obtained a pension under the act of March 18, 1818, and his pension has been continued to him under the act of 1820;" that "this pension was granted for the same service performed by Jacque Monty in Hazen's regiment;" that "it is understood that the roll bearing the name spelled Jack was the one referred to in allowing claims under the act of 1818;" that "it would require very clear and strict proof to establish the fact, to the satisfaction of this office, that the name Jaques had been transformed into the English John through the several mutations of Jacque and Jack, although such may have been the fact;" and that "the application of John Monty for bounty land under the act of March 3, 1855, has been suspended solely upon the grounds herein stated."

It is further proved by the petitioner that his father, Francis Monty, was a lieutenant in the Canadian regiment, (see American State Papers, "Claims," page 94,) until six of his sons were enrolled as soldiers, viz: Francis Monty, jr., James Monty, Joseph Monty, Placide Monty, Amable or Abraham Monty, and John Monty, all of whom were pensioned under the act of 1818.—(See pension lists of New York, county of Clinton.) The said James or Jaques was pensioned under the said act of 1818, and died July 9, 1819. And the said John or Jack was pensioned under the same act, and the only survivor of a family of nine children and one hundred and ten descendants. It is unnecessary that your committee should animadvert further on the testimony in the case before them. From the showing of the Pension office, John or Jack Monty never did receive the bounty, gratuity and land he was clearly entitled to; and if Jacques or James did, (of which there can be no doubt,) your committee cannot see any good reason why the prayer of the petitioner should not be granted, and the resolution of Congress passed at the second session of the second Congress extended to him, which resolution is in the following words:

"Resolved, That provision ought to be made by law for donations of land to the Canadian and Nova Scotia refugees, in conformity with the resolutions of Congress of the 23d of April, 1783, promising the

same."

And they report a bill accordingly.